UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Should Single Women Adopt Children? - - - - - - - - - - *Ethel S. Beer*

Two Attitudes - - - - *Leonard B. Gray*

Improving Coördination - - *Herbert Sturges*

Ethics and Democracy - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

Western Conference News

Volume CXXXIX NUMBER 3

Chicago, September-October, 1953

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly *Except During July-August*

Subscription $1.50 *Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

Curtis W. Reese, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

Leonard B. Gray: Minister of the Second Congregational Church, East Douglas, Massachusetts.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Herbert Sturges: Former teacher in the Cibecue Day School, Cibecue, Arizona.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 35

ARTICLES—

Should Single Women Adopt Children?—Ethel S. Beer 36

Two Attitudes—Leonard B. Gray 38

Improving Coordination—Herbert Sturges 40

Ethics and Democracy—Leo Hirsch 41

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 47

THE FIELD—

New Security Order—*ACLU Bulletin* 34

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion"

New Security Order

The American Civil Liberties Union presented its comments on the new security order in a letter to President Eisenhower signed by executive director Patrick Murphy Malin. The President, when he announced the proposed order on June 17, requested government agencies and private individuals and organizations to submit their views.

The new order, the ACLU said, represents a "marked improvement" over the original order of President Truman. "It will encourage the dissemination of information vital to public understanding of government operations as well as defend the function of a free press to transmit such news." Singled out as improvements were the elimination of the "restricted" classification, a more specific definition of other classifications, and reduction in the number of agencies having to classify security information.

The Union's only criticism of the Eisenhower order was the failure to provide for a central authority outside of the government and "free of the prejudice of individual government agencies," who could act as a "public defender" of the public's right to information. The danger of bias, it continued, is reduced by limiting the authority to classify information to the head of the agency, without power to delegate authority to subordinates. The Union suggested that when the new order is reviewed in the future, consideration again be given to appointment of a "public defender" of public information.

"One of our objections to the original order, that its wide scope interfered with freedom of the press, appears to have been met by a revision reducing the number of government agencies who will have authority to classify information. This change, and the provision for reviewing classified material for the purpose of removing the classification, or down-grading it, when the interests of national security no longer require it, should permit the press to better carry out its special function in our democracy of keeping the public fully and accurately informed."

—*ACLU Bulletin.*

UNITY

VOLUME CXXXIX SEPT.-OCT., 1953 No. 3

EDITORIAL

Now that Federal Union, under the title, Council of Liberal Churches, has been formally ratified by both the American Unitarian Association and the Universalist Church of America, the two denominations have entered into a close working relationship involving immediately identity of interests in Education, Publications, and Public Relations, with provision for delegating to the Council of Liberal Churches additional functions from time to time. Those of us in both denominations who were not too enthusiastic about Federal Union should now bend every effort to make the plan work satisfactorily for all concerned. For long years these two denominations have stood out prominently for liberty in religious thought. They have worked together in many ways and there has been much interchange of membership and ministerial fellowship. They have both been regarded as heretics by the evangelical denominations. The pooling of their policies and resources would seem to be long overdue. The wisdom of the original promoters of Federal Union has been demonstrated. They moved with caution, and in ways that made the members of the local churches conscious of, and participants in, the process. The way was made easier by the fact that for some years there has been common use of *Hymns of the Spirit* and of Religious Education materials. Also the education of ministers of both denominations in the same theological schools has had good effect, as has the easy passage of ministers from one Fellowship to the other. And there has been some experience in the joint founding of churches. Next steps should obviously be the union of the Departments of the Ministry and the Departments of Church Extension as early as possible. The Ministers' Associations should proceed at once to consolidate. The Service Committees have a close working relationship that should be further developed. At the area level there is little in the way of federating State and District Conferences. All possible advantage should be taken of the present mood and enthusiasm to speedily consolidate the gains already made and to initiate new steps. The eyes of all denominations will be upon us. We must move forward together with the spiritual statesmanship that the times demand. We must let no petty jealousies, no pride of history, and no vested interests stand in the way of the rapid development of the Council of Liberal Churches.

Curtis W. Reese.

Should Single Women Adopt Children?

ETHEL S. BEER

A few years ago a book appeared, written by Ann Barley, with an intriguing title, *Patrick Calls Me Mother*. The gist of the story was the search of a young American girl in postwar Europe for a child to adopt. After considerable difficulty she found Patrick, a small French waif, and brought him home to the United States. Thus the author became a mother, even though she was single. And judging from her account and the picture of the jolly little boy, taken a few years later, all went well.

Because I tried to adopt a child and failed when I was younger, I was particularly interested in this tale. Legally any adult person as well as a married couple may adopt a child. But this provision presumably applies to relatives. Although apparently no state law in this country prohibits single women from adopting children, they find it hard if not impossible. Actually no material on the over-all picture is available. However, agencies seldom place children of any age, and practically never babies, with single women. They claim that the influence of a father is essential in addition to that of the mother. Psychologically every child needs a masculine and a feminine parent. Granting that these premises are justified, as a general rule, women alone do rear children successfully. Widows and divorcees prove this statement again and again. So do some unmarried women, when given a chance, as happens occasionally because of a previous connection with the child. At any rate closing any door to adoption seems wrong. Rather, every application should be examined on its merits and not be discarded because of a hard and fast rule.

Due to the restrictions single women usually adopt children more by accident than intention. Perhaps a blood tie exists as in the case of Joe.

"He's my son, not my nephew now," Joe's maiden aunt—an established professional woman—explained proudly, in her slightly raucous voice. She looked fondly at the lanky schoolboy with his ink-stained hands, who had just come home and greeted her with an affectionate hug.

Joe could not remember his mother, who had died when he was a baby. Shortly afterwards his father sent him to his aunt, and ultimately allowed her to adopt him. Busy as she was with her career, she never hesitated to take on this extra burden. But although she stumbled on motherhood inadvertently, she did a fine job. Joe grew up to be a well-adjusted young man, a credit to his adopted mother.

With single women, already devoting their lives to the children of others, circumstances may lead up to adoption. Probably this happens more frequently when an attachment for a particular child already exists.

"I've applied for Betty's adoption," the Director of a Day Nursery in a large city confided. Her calm face minimized the big step she was about to take, a spinster in late middle age assuming charge of a lively twelve-year-old girl.

Originally Betty came to the Day Nursery as a baby. Her mother worked but disappeared from time to time. Then the Director kept Betty at night, too. At this point the mother evidently had vanished for good. The police could not trace her. The father had deserted his family long ago. Betty had no other close relative. So the Director decided to take the legal steps to bind Betty to her forever. Not long afterwards her request was granted. Betty became the daughter of the Director. Nor were the two ever separated until the mother died. By that time the Director had retired from the Day Nursery and Betty was married with a child of her own.

"I'm so glad Mother lived to enjoy my baby. She had such fun playing with him," wrote Betty after the funeral. Her letter was full of affection for her mother, an elderly woman, who might have been dubbed "an old maid."

Unwanted children, such as Peony, may appeal to the single woman, altruistically inclined. When the school play was over, this dainty six-year-old danced up to her adopted mother. They were a vivid contrast, the serious, fair-skinned American woman—no longer young—and the gay little girl with her straight black hair and almond shaped eyes. But their expressions portrayed the affection they had for each other.

Neither Peony's Oriental father nor his family would bring her up after the death of her mother, an American of English extraction. Her mixed heritage made her a problem to place elsewhere. So the kindly district nurse took the wee baby home. Already she had a grown son—a European orphan from World War I. Nevertheless, she welcomed Peony as a member of her household, and in due time legitimized the arrangement. And up to date everything has worked out splendidly.

In faraway New Zealand an emergency brought mild, elderly Miss Berry her adopteds sons. She was the owner and manager of a straw hat factory, which I visited. The boys were eight and ten years respectively then, fine sturdy lads with bare brown legs and twinkles in their eyes. Until a few years before, Miss Berry had lived alone in a little house with a garden, on the outskirts of a town, where she cultivated roses as a hobby. Then during a flu epidemic she volunteered to shelter two small boys until their parents recovered. Instead, both the mother and the father died, and Miss Berry kept the youngsters.

"I just couldn't let them go to an Orphanage," she asserted modestly. Apparently it never entered her head that she had made a sacrifice in changing her life so drastically. Fortunately her unselfishness paid off. Miss Berry and her adopted sons were very happy together.

Of course, adopting children left on one's doorstep, so to speak, is rather different from seeking a tiny stranger. Then competition exists because all the applications cannot be filled. According to accepted adoption practices married couples are preferred. Supposedly a secure home must have two parents, one of each sex. Agencies, both public and private, use single women for adoption placement only as a last resort. Under most circumstances such a decision is comprehensible. But the frequent statement by lay people that children adopted by single women start off handicapped is illogical.

No official data exists about single women and adoption. The mere fact that she is less divided in her interests and affections may give her an advantage over

a wife. The devotion of a single woman may be just what the adopted child needs for confidence. Nor does "smothering"—too much mother love that makes for dependence—always result. Besides, two parents do not guard against this condition at all, while the worst offender frequently is the nurse or governess in households of means, who incidentally usually is unmarried. Yet agencies place children there.

Unfortunately, too, the most careful selection cannot guarantee adopted children two parents. Death takes its toll. Split marriages are very common nowadays. And a crushed widow or embittered divorcee may be a far worse influence for a child than a balanced single woman.

"I feel sorry for Beatrice," a young friend of hers said. "Her mother doesn't act as though she wanted her. Now that her father has left, she hasn't anybody at all." With the uncanny perception of youth this girl had summed the situation up well.

Beatrice's father had always wished for children. He and his wife had everything their hearts desired. Or at least he thought so. But instead of a daughter bringing happiness, dissension occurred soon after her adoption. Beatrice had high-salaried nurses and governesses but little intimacy with her mother. The father did pay some attention to her. But he was a busy man. Matters grew worse when he moved away. Once divorced, he remarried and ironically enough had children of his own. However, Beatrice had to stay with her mother who was more remote than ever now. Her whole attitude showed that she regretted adopting a child, which she had done to please her husband in the first place. Beatrice was bewildered. Naturally, too, she missed her father keenly. No wonder she became a shy, timid girl, evoking pity from her friends.

Unquestionably, adopted children should have as normal an environment as possible. Only, above all, they require a happy home. If this contains a father and a mother, deeply attached to them and one another, so much the better. Probably genuine warmth and understanding are even more important for adopted children than others, in order to build up their sense of belonging. Because they are supersensitive about their status, they must have careful handling. Already puzzled by a lack of knowledge about their real parents, they may brood if slighted by those who have adopted them. If thwarted in their development, they may feel misplaced.

"I wish you'd adopted me," thirteen-year-old Marie told her unmarried aunt, a kindergarten teacher unstylishly dressed but with a rare gift for children. "You wouldn't make me wear these silly clothes and go to dancing school, which I hate." The girl glanced down scornfully at her dainty but fussy frock and in exasperation swept off her large straw hat, loosening a mass of rebellious red curls.

Although Marie had been adopted as a baby, she did not fit into her parents' pattern of existence. The father, a business executive, was always rushed and rarely had time for his family. The mother was a social leader in a suburban town, who only wanted a daughter to follow in her footsteps. Instead, much to her annoyance, Marie was a real tomboy.

The pay-off came some years later. In defiance of her parents, Marie married a guide, met on a camping trip. Three children came in rapid succession. Marie's husband proved absolutely unreliable and unable to support his family. By this time her mother was a widow. Out of a sense of duty she helped her daughter financially, insisting though on a divorce. Time had not softened the older woman. She was more demanding of Marie than ever and constantly interfered with the children. The favorite of the grandmother was the only girl, a rare beauty with Marie's red hair and her father's deep blue eyes, whom she hoped to win to her social aspirations.

Of course, many married women are excellent adopted mothers. Fathers are a great asset, too. Nevertheless the ability to cope with children does not depend on the wedding ring. Perhaps it is superfluous to add that one good parent is more desirable than two poor ones. Even with a father and a mother, children can feel deprived, if most of their intimate care is delegated to paid help. The single woman does not have so many drives to pull her away from her adopted child. Besides, to exclude the group as a whole is narrowing the field. And for the sake of the children no potential home should be eliminated.

Often unmarried women show their desire for motherhood by the lives they lead. They seize every opportunity to have contact with children, both in their personal relations and in work. To scorn these manifestations as emotional outlets is ignoring the value of the contributions.

Although unmarried aunts rarely live with their married sisters and brothers today, they still share the responsibility of bringing up nieces and nephews rather frequently. Without stint they give financially, deeming it a pleasure not a sacrifice. Sometimes they do much more.

Joan's aunt was a graduate nurse, who had never married. Devoted to children, she was always ready to pay for the extra expenses in the ever-increasing family of her brother.

"I'm keeping Joan for the winter," she announced. "I want to build her up and have her tonsils out by a specialist here before she goes home."

Joan at seven was the oldest of four. Her father made only a modest salary. They lived in a small town with few health facilities. So he was only too glad to accept the help of his sister.

"For the last twelve years I've done practically nothing but look after my niece and nephew," another aunt, a handsome single woman—still comparatively young—related. "Actually I've been mother to Patty all her seventeen years because my sister was too sick to care for her.

Patty and her brother lost their parents as children. Their aunt was left their sole guardian. They had money, which she had to administer, as well as plan for their education and other details of their bringing-up. Cheerfully the aunt undertook all this responsibility, all the more grave as she had nobody to help her. Neither did she regret it.

Single women without calls from their family may turn to the children of strangers. Borrowing a child from a neighbor or friend is common. Some compensate for their maternal yearning by entering a profession dealing with children, such as nursing, teaching, social service, and so forth. Such experience can be excellent preparation for motherhood. As a rule, single women contemplating adoption have handled the children of others. Besides they are ready to settle down, which is not always true about young couples. Certainly, single women who have concentrated all their lives on children should be able to measure up for

adoption. For unless they are potential mothers in feeling, they would not want to take the step at all.

Unmarried women are opposed as mothers because a normal family contains two parents. A child needs the intimacy of both sexes for its development. Agencies rigidly uphold these theories. And because they are the most reliable sources for adopted children, the chance of a single woman is at a minimum. But since children do grow up adjusted in homes with only a mother, status should not limit adoption. Rather, the test should be on an individual basis that includes every feature of the prospective home. Some single women are suitable to adopt children and just as surely some couples are not.

Two Attitudes

LEONARD B. GRAY

I invite you to consider with me two attitudes that people have toward absolute truth and toward other people. The first attitude is dogmatic certainty entertained by many people, perhaps by the majority. The persons who have this attitude are altogether certain that they know what absolute truths are and just as certain that all their fellow men should believe and follow these alleged absolutes.

We believe that there are some absolute truths. But who can be sure what all these truths are? And are there not some principles and attitudes to guide us, both when we know and when we do not know what truth is? I suppose there are some universal criteria as to what is right and what is wrong, and yet probably only a few criteria, if any, held by all good and well-meaning people in all places and times. Also, likely more often than not, right and wrong are relative matters, depending upon time, place, cultural levels, and circumstances.

In the realm of religion the difficulty of finding absolutes is greater, I believe, than in most, if not all, other realms. Who can know the absolute truths about God, Christ, and the meaning of life? And yet a lot of people are sure that they know what the absolutes in religion are, and they are sure that all other people should believe and live as they do. But is the certainty of these people sufficient reason for others being certain about the same things? Even if these people were right, in addition to being certain, would it be a sufficient reason for others having the same certainty? Have not people the right to disbelieve the truth until they are convinced? Are not many people sincere and honest and good even when they do not believe the truth? Is it not better for one to disbelieve the truth than to be forced to believe the truth or to be forced to say that he believes the truth? Are not some disbelievers of the truth finer than those who try to force others to believe what they believe even when what the latter believe is the truth?

But people with dogmatic certainty get things done, many say. History plainly shows that such people do get things done. They win converts, set up missions, build great churches, spread religion across continents, and combat many evils. Indeed, they get things done, many good things, we will be fair enough to say. But at what expense? At times at the expense of human life, often at the expense of the worth of people as individuals, of their freedom, of their right to independent thinking, in short at the expense of the infinite value of human personality.

This leads me to one of my main claims, namely this: the worse things about many of these dogmatically certain people are not their certainties which are probably often far from the truth but rather their efforts, at times domineering and pugnacious and cruel, to get other people to be certain about the same things that they are certain about and to live as they do. And so, even if these people were right about religious absolutes, the wrong they do to other people makes them worse than being wrong about religious absolutes would make them. And this wrong that they do to their fellow men more than offsets the good we have already admitted they do at times. Besides blocking continuous search for truth, such people sin against the worth of human personality and so, even when they are right about religious matters, they supply examples of being wrong while being right, indeed of being wrong to a greater degree than being right.

One night in a discussion group a young lady said: "We ought to find what the one true religion is and get all people to adopt it and to live by it." The leader asked: "What do you think the one true religion is?" The young lady gave her opinion. The leader asked several others the same question. No two persons said exactly the same thing, and some differed widely from most of the others. "Ah, here we have it," exclaimed the leader, "here we have in miniature the whole world. There are many people in the world certain that they have the one true religion and they are trying to get others to be certain about the same thing and when they don't succeed in their efforts they get angry at what they call the ignorance and stubbornness of those who refuse to adopt their beliefs and ways. This has created and is creating the awful religious mess we are in. This accounts for many of the intolerances, bigotries, cruelties and divisions among religious people."

Lest I be misunderstood, let me strongly assert that I believe that there are absolute truths, that we need absolutes in religion and in life and a measure of certainty about at least some of these absolutes. But my main point is that I want the second attitude I have in mind, the attitude of reverence and humility toward absolutes, especially toward those that are largely enshrouded in clouds of mystery, and toward people of various beliefs, forms of worship, and ways of living. This attitude incites an eager, open-minded, constant search for truth that a cocksureness based on insufficient facts does not incite. There is far too much dogmatic certainty that puts opinions, generally a mixture of falsehoods and half-truths, into a bag and ties the bag which naturally stops an eager search for truth. Once when President-emeritus Ernest Hopkins of Dartmouth was President of this college he said, "It isn't what people don't know that gets them into trouble, it is what they don't know but are sure they know that gets them into trouble." To which we can add that it is also, at times, people knowing the truth and trying overhard to put it onto others that gets them and their fellow men into trouble. Loving truth and our fellows more than our personal opinions of truth prevents this trouble.

I am not sure that Goethe was right when he said, "as soon as we define God we lose Him," but I like this great German poet's attitude in making this statement better than the dogmatic attitude that is altogether certain what God is like. Said a president of a great college several years ago, "I do not know what God is like." Even should we grant that we can know what God is like to some extent, I like this president's attitude in saying this much better than that of the college chaplain's in saying immediately after the meeting, "He should not have said that," and in proceeding to say in a dogmatic manner what he thought God is like. When we are reasonably sure that we know the truth about something, let us be humble enough to admit that there is a possibility that we are wrong. Also, when we have this reasonable certainty that we are right let us grant the other fellow the right to hold a different opinion from ours. Grant him the possibility of being right, but chiefly grant him the right of differing from us whether he is right or wrong. The main point is not chiefly a matter as to who is right. It is chiefly a matter of realizing that he has just as much right to hold his opinion as we have of holding ours and of freely granting him his right to hold his opinion. Then, too, let us bear in mind that one can live a genuine religious life without knowing many absolutes, even without certainty about many and, along with this, bear in mind that people of diverse religious beliefs can and do live genuine religious lives. Both Henry Drummond, a liberal, and Dwight L. Moody, a conservative, were genuine Christians and close friends who respected and loved each other and did a lot of good for their fellow men in many parts of the world.

This attitude of reverence for truth and for human personality will move us to start not with ourselves, but with our fellow men in trying to serve them. It will move us to get off our own stands and onto the stands of others and to help them just where they are, where they think and believe and live, with their peculiar types of mind, viewpoints, conditions, life-situations, and needs existing sympathetically in our minds and directing our methods of approach to them. It will move us to help our fellows to become fine people in the best ways for them to become fine people, to make them or rather to help them to make themselves out of their own peculiar bents, temperaments, abilities, and opportunities, not out of ours. Instead of trying to put ourselves onto others, this attitude will induce us to help them to grow out of their actual selves and in the ways best for them to grow. This was the attitude that Hughes Mearns urged us to have when he wrote in his article, "Every Child Has a Gift,": "Stop trying to make children what they eventually ought to be and take up the practical business of seeing what they really are now. Set aside the reproving eye and the authoritative command and substitute impersonal observation."

The worst thing about dogmatic certainty is not that it is generally based partly on ignorance, undesirable as this surely is, but rather that it is to no small degree based on selfishness and egotism. Reverence for truth and personality in contrast is based on high intelligence and the greatest unselfishness. It was out of his intelligence and fine unselfishness that Emerson said: "My business is to make you unlike me," which was simply to say in the Concord Sage's customary indirect and extravagant way of putting things: "My business is to make you like yourself." In this statement was the Sage's typical and general attitude toward people throughout his life despite the fact that this usually magnanimous and unselfish man tried for a time to get Henry Thoreau to adopt some of his main ideas and rejoiced that Thoreau did so for a few years. In the main, Emerson showed us both by his teaching and his practice that man attains his highest unselfishness toward his fellows when he sloughs off his own ego and encourages them to build their best possible selves out of the stuff of which they are made and within the frameworks of their particular life-situations. Voltaire, too, scaled the heights to the uplands of high reverence for truth and personality and of unselfishness when he said: "I may not agree with what you say, but I will fight to the death for your right to say it." So did Thomas Jefferson when he said: "I am resolved to fight all tyranny over the mind of man." I see no other than this attitude of Emerson, Voltaire, and Jefferson that will promote a continuous search for truth, encourage each individual to become his best, and improve the art of our living together.

As a matter of fact this is the only attitude that can make us the most helpful to our fellow men. All efforts to help a person except those motivated by this attitude serve only to pull him out of his natural orbit and to keep him from becoming a fully-developed human being. Imagine the great harm that would have been done to Henry Thoreau if he had been pulled out of his usual places and ways of living for any considerable length of time. His Concord fields and woods and his mode of life were peculiarly made, as it were, for him, and he for them. While the exact relationship of this great independent to his habitat is the only one known in history and probably unsuitable to most, if not all, other people still it remains a fact, I believe, that like this lover of solitary places and hater of society's chains every other person needs a particular adjustment to some peculiar conditions and influences for his greatest growth and happiness. Essentially the same harm is done to every other person when he is pulled or persuaded out of his natural orbit as would have been done to Thoreau had he not been allowed to follow his drummer and to march in his parade, even though probably not so great as to this great individualist. I think of an example in the community in which I live. One middle-aged man loves Cub Scouting with his whole heart and soul and gives much time to this important work. I know that he is hurt by some criticism from his neighbors who want him to give less time to this work and more to something else, but he would be hurt and frustrated much worse, and also the boys would be deprived of a fine leadership, if these townspeople could succeed in pulling him out of his true alley. This man is made for his particular alley as much as Thoreau was made for his, I believe, and he needs his alley for his sake and for society's sake even as the Concord independent needed his. No man can truly and fully develop himself save according to the pattern best suited for the full bringing out of his particular inherent powers even though he should and can adapt himself harmoniously to other people and learn much from them. Let us then be so disinterested that our efforts, which we think are of service to others, are really serving them, not merely ourselves. Let us be wise enough and unselfish enough to respect the personalities of our fellow men by encouraging them to become their best possible selves in ways that are the most natural and helpful for their development.

Improving Coördination

HERBERT STURGES

The efficiency and stability of a social system depend on the continuous enterprising ingenuity its people can exercise in a world of changing conditions. Often social institutions collapse because their structure is adapted to a situation which no longer exists. What was at one time a clever social invention becomes an archaic contraption, worthless under new conditions. A social group which goes on trying to use such antiquated institutional junk is destined to disillusionment, distress, and disaster.

This is exactly what is happening to the political institutions of the Western World. They are failing to produce coördination of the professions, business, finance, industry, agriculture, and labor. Each social group can contribute greatly to society and demand maximum returns from the total economy. Each group can be highly productive and deserves the reward it seeks. But the growth of their potential individual productivity cannot reliably insure high returns until we greatly improve the coördination of their activities. As these different social groups develop, it becomes increasingly evident that this necessary coördination cannot be satisfactorily provided by our present political institutions.

Let us remember that *polis* is a city, a geographical area. The purpose of political institutions is coördination on a geographic basis. Our own representative government is constituted in this way. These political institutions were vitally necessary and sufficient in the early stages of our social development. It seems fairly clear that when each city or district is homogeneous in its activity and interests, geographic representative government is able to coördinate the activities and serve the interests. Such unity within a city was never perfect. The potential disparity of purpose between landlord and tenant, employer and employee, shopkeeper and customer, always existed. But these differences were not perceived. The social status of the individual did not take clear form in his thought. Each person considered himself and was willing to be treated by others as a citizen, a member of a city, a state or a nation. All the people of a city agreed in recognizing their predominant interest in their common interest as citizens. Local patriotism was supreme. Not yet did class interests appear in men's minds. The individual did not think of himself as a landlord or tenant, boss or laborer, but as a native son, owing his sole allegiance to the community which gave him his life and supported him in his work.

Government as we know it, based on representation of geographic areas, can be justified only by the existence in each locality of a consciousness of coalescence and homogeneity among all the people of the area represented. Such local unity rarely exists today. In rural areas agriculture predominates. But nowadays there is a growing awareness of divergence of interests between tenants and owner farmers, and between employers and workers. In urban centers the consciousness of disunity is increasing faster and faster. The older feudalistic relations between employer and employee are being broken down by the absentee management and control inherent in far-flung corporations and industry-wide labor unions. Until these newly conscious groups are recognized and directly represented in city, state, and national government, their coördination is very imperfect.

In our twentieth century America the feudal allegiance of the serf to his overlord has largely disappeared. Now the poor begin to feel the difference of their interests from those of the rich. Their leaders tell them that the right of property guaranteed by our constitution means the right of all, not just a few.

New bonds of loyalty replace the old. The laborers of Detroit have much more cohesive group feeling with their fellow-workers in Cleveland and Toledo than they have towards their banker, merchant, and industrialist fellow-citizens of Detroit. The farmers of Minnesota recognize their common interests with the tillers of the soil of Kansas and Iowa to be greater than with the city folk of Minneapolis and St. Paul. Slowly but surely economic class consciousness fills the vacuum left when geographic homogeneity fades away.

But these new unities have no direct means of influencing legislation. The problem is complex and confusing. For example, there seems to be no good reason that a representative of a manufacturing district should help to enact laws favorable either to the factory owners, or to the workers. The solution seems to be direct representation in government of all these special activities.

With the relative decline of area group feeling and the growth of economic loyalties which cross territorial boundaries, the usefulness of geographic representative government receives a sharp setback. The absence of concrete interest representation in our system of government is a serious handicap to the continuous efficiency of socio-economic processes. Special interest groups undertake to influence lawmaking indirectly by means and methods not recognized in the framework of government. This condition disturbs the reasonable mutual respect among the people. No special interest likes to see the lobbies of other groups working to influence legislation. The fault is not that of the special interests but the lack of a proper means for their expression through channels of direct interest representation in government.

The meaning and value of our political institutions are undermined by the constant extra-constitutional pressures and counter-pressures exerted by these lobbies. This increasingly chaotic condition in legislation is a growing menace to our social peace and security. The legitimate special interests need reliable direct representation instead of these halfway roundabout methods.

Our present political institutions of geographical representation belong to the horse and buggy age. They no longer serve properly to harmonize and coördinate the economic activities of our people. Lacking suitable political procedures we have more and more conflict between social classes, and increasingly wasteful interference with the processes of production and exchange. In the absence of suitable political coördination our free enterprise system can go all to pieces. Such a gloomy expectation seems not unreasonable considering that the Lazy Fairy is still running the show.

The remedy for this condition, the protection from this danger, seem to require a thorough rethinking of the meaning and purpose of government, and such

reordering of our political institutions as may seem desirable.

To me the purpose of government is to promote harmony in social relations which we may call coöperation, and efficiency in economic processes which is coördination; and to achieve these ends as much as possible by education, with a minimum of compulsion.

Every citizen should study the politico-socio-economic process, prepare to take a useful part in the work of the world, and learn to understand the value of the contribution of others. By studying coöperation and coördination we can all gain an appreciation of our own role in society, and the necessity also of the effort of everyone in the world for the common good of mankind. It is of course far easier to describe such a program than to get it into actual operation; but that is the job: to create in all people a willingness to make appreciated contributions to the total work of the world, and to appreciate the work of others.

This understanding and good will in the individual is one side of the picture, the other side being the achievement of social harmony and economic all-round efficiency. Both sides can develop together gradually. This is largely an unconscious process, but conscious effort may help some.

Some idea of possible progressive steps in politico-economic institutions may be gained from recent developments in Ireland.

On the first of July, 1937, the people of Ireland enacted a new constitution, which went into effect on December 29 of that year. Articles fifteen through twenty-seven concern the National Parliament, which according to Article fifteen "shall be called . . . the Oireachtas." It is further provided that "the Oireachtas shall consist of the President and two Houses, viz.: a House of Representatives to be called Dáil Eireann and a Senate to be called Seanad Eireann."

Articles sixteen and seventeen deal with Dáil Eireann. It is stated that "Dáil Eireann shall be composed of members who represent constituencies determined by law . . . on the system of proportional representation." Thus the traditional plan of geographical representation is retained by Ireland in Dáil Eireann.

Articles eighteen and nineteen of the new constitution cover the composition and duties of Seanad Eireann. It is to consist of "sixty members, of whom eleven shall be nominated members and forty-nine shall be elected members. . . . The elected members . . . shall be elected as follows: (1) Three shall be elected by the National University of Ireland. (2) Three shall be elected by the University of Dublin. (3) Forty-three shall be elected from panels of candidates. . . ."

There are to be "five panels of candidates . . . containing respectively the names of persons having knowledge and practical experience of the following interests and services, namely: (1) National Language and Culture, Literature, Art, Education and such professional interests as may be defined by law for the purpose of this panel; (2) Agriculture and allied interests, and Fisheries; (3) Labour, whether organised or unorganised; (4) Industry and Commerce, including banking, finance, accountancy, engineering and architecture; (5) Public Administration and social services, including voluntary social activities." Article nineteen presents a possible alternative plan for the election of its representatives "by any functional or vocational group or association or council. . . ."

These facts are taken from a 117-page booklet on the Constitution of Ireland, available at the Government Publications Sale Office, 3-4 College Street, Dublin. The price in 1937 was fourpence.

The provision for direct representation of "interests and services" in the new Irish Senate sets a good example. All city, state, and national governments need it. Perhaps unicameral city councils, state and national legislatures can be established, including both area and interest representation.

In World Government the representation of the nations will be a large feature, especially at first, since each nation has the feeling of oneness which is the basis for representation. We will be glad to see the lessening of international tensions which World Government can produce. As the memory and the fear of war subside, and bitterness is forgotten, such area representation can become less and less significant. Thus the state as a conflict group can "wither away." We can foresee these steps in the growth of world peace, and this foresight may accelerate them.

Similarly, the opportunity for meeting as equals in local and national legislatures can be the means of reducing hostility among economic groups. This is greatly to be desired, as can be clearly seen in our own country. That is what we mean by improving coördination.

Ireland has made a good start. Now let us see what we can do!

Ethics and Democracy

LEO HIRSCH

Ethics broadly defined is the art and science of human conduct. It guides us in what our conduct "ought to be" in the circle of human relations.

Life consists in the maintenance of relations; it requires continual adjustment. As we rise to personal relations, neither appropriation nor surrender, neither egoism nor altruism, nor indeed any precisely measured mechanical mixture of the two will solve the problem. Here the recognition of a common good, a commonwealth in which each person, whether black, brown, yellow, red or white, has an equal worth with every other, is the only satisfactory ethical attitude. "Be a person and respect the personality of others," is the duty in this human sphere. The conception of ethics herein described exhibits an organic whole of interrelated members and their harmonious conduct in maintaining a unity of duty and purpose. Like the cosmos in the outer world, it is the cosmos of the inner spiritual world.

Where does this ethical directive come from? It comes from that faculty that man alone possesses which we call conscience. It is reason plus experience plus something else which it is impossible to define and which is innate in man. It is an affirmation of

the infinite worth of every human being. So that ethics is a matter of faith—faith in man and his worth. This worth is the basis for our free community, for all our compassion, for all our hopes in brotherhood and peace. Ancient prophets proclaimed it and lived it. There is no authority that can prove it. Righteousness is of ourselves. It does not lend itself to scientific, empiric proof. The measure of its existence is the measure of our ethical living. Great religious leaders have always tried to implement this affirmation to the infinite worth of human beings by some basic principle that would guide us and inspire us to ethical achievement.

The Hebrew prophet Micah's rule was: "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God?" A universally quoted rule was the Golden Rule which, in one form or other, appears in the teachings of nearly all the old religions. Some put it negatively and others in positive form. In the Christian Scriptures it appears as: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even unto them." Emanuel Kant tried to formulate this basis as follows: "So act that your conduct may be capable of becoming the universal law of all rational beings." Our modern prophet Felix Adler's rule was: "So act as to elicit the unique personality in others and thereby in thyself." The writer prefers this last to all the others because the emphasis is put on *elicit* and on the joint pursuit of the two ends, that of the other and that of the self, and thus it transcends both egoism and altruism, and synthesizes religion and ethics. Here is the rule that ought to guide us and inspire us to our democratic way of life and to all democratic action. It pays tribute both to the individual and to society. If Felix Adler had never been known for anything else but the formulation of this supreme ethical rule, he would have been proclaimed as making the greatest single ethical contribution of the twentieth century. It will stand for many centuries as the incomparable statement, in a single sentence, of the new synthesis of religion and ethics as applicable to the modern scene and its hunger for the democratic ideal.

Ethics is not an epiphenomenon, it is not a by-product, it is a creative, dynamic power in the life of man. It cannot be relegated to a subsidiary role. It must be central to all our actions. This changes our *modus operandi* from belief to conduct. It is a ceaseless attempt to increase the good and eliminate the evil.

The several duties are parts of a comprehensive righteousness, which includes the acts of all men. The several virtues are so many aspects of one all-embracing moral ideal. The rewards and penalties which follow virtue and vice are the expression of a constitution of things which makes for righteousness.

Our account of ethics, however, would be seriously incomplete were we to fail to point out the immense and indispensable strength and help we may gain for the moral life by approaching it in the religious spirit.

Ethics and religion each needs the other. They are, in reality, one the detailed and particular, the other the comprehensive and universal aspect of the same world of duty and virtue. Morality without religion is a cold, dry, dreary set of rules and requirements. Religion without ethics is an empty, formal, unsubstantial shadow. Only when the two are united, only when we bring to the particular duties of ethics the infinite aspiration and inspiration of religion, and give to the universal form of religion the concrete contents of human and temporal relationships, do we gain a spiritual life which is at the same time clear and strong, elevated and practical, ideal and real. To the ethically religious man there is open a boundless career for service, sacrifice, and devotion.

In our search for ethical truth, we must recognize the slow, painful but positive evolutionary growth of this social science. In recent generations, it has passed as a truism that we cannot understand the present ethical standards unless we know something of their crude beginnings in the dim past and how the present ethical values evolved. It ought to be even more obvious that we cannot understand the life of the past unless we already have a clear knowledge of life in our own day. Without any knowledge of technology, politics, and economics, we cannot begin to appreciate the minds and motives and aspirations of remote ages. Now, a true understanding of the past is not only an intellectual good in itself but a vital necessity if we are to avoid clinging to those narrow ethical standards which make us misjudge the minds and motives of our predecessors as well as those of our contemporaries who live under somewhat different conditions. Hence, knowledge of the past is necessary to curb the exaggerated idea of our own originality and of the uniqueness of our own age and problems.

How did we evolve out of savagery to our present standards of civilization? What were the factors that helped us to grow out of slavery, then out of feudalism, into our present free communities? Some day, someone will write such a history of ethics. Perhaps we can get a glimpse of truth and help from the penetrating mind of the late Felix Adler, the founder of the Ethical Movement. He was grounded in the ethics of the past and was a keen interpreter of the ethical content in the old religions, besides being a prophet of the modern world. The keynote of his whole life-work was his insistence on the *autonomy of ethical truth,* i.e., its independence of religious, metaphysical, or any other creed or dogma. Dogma in its historic sense means an assertion which is said to be true because of some alleged authority superior to reason and evidence. In the past, the Church laid down certain rules of faith and belief called dogmas. It was not permissible to reason about these dogmas and creeds. Inquiry was not allowed and they were not to be checked by evidence. Felix Adler took a radical and revolutionary step, because up to then it was religious dogma that formulated and prescribed ethical rules and conduct.

Following, in the main, the Kantian attitude of the primacy of the moral conscience, he held that faith in the supreme value of righteousness and the pursuit thereof does not depend on any religious belief in a supernatural power and influence in human affairs. Adler also recognized that the primacy of the moral imperative is incompatible with its being a mere corollary of, or deduction from, physics, biology, descriptive sociology, or any other natural science. He made the point that the method employed by ethics must be the opposite of that employed by the physical sciences. I now quote him:

> As against the iniquitous practices of the world, as against the exploitation of labor, as against the degradation of woman, as against political tyranny, whether exercized by kings or by mobs, we raise up for our shield the indefeasible worth of man—not of some but of all men.

As his starting point he attributed worth to men how-

ever unworthy they may actually be. Out of this premise came the inevitable corollary of the moral equality of men, attributing worth to all men.

If we reject the view that might is right, if the long struggle of heroes and martyrs against the prevailing injustice and iniquity has any meaning, then that which has prevailed in the past can no more be the test of what is right than that which prevails today. Some ethical principle or principles must be elaborated and applied to the historical material before we can possibly draw any moral lessons from any account of past events. This is a simple matter of logic. A syllogism cannot yield a conclusion of what "ought to be" unless the premises contain statements about what "ought to be."

Adler courageously accepted the logical consequences of the Socratic view that moral truths are to be discovered by rational inquiry. If, however, moral truth is not revealed once and for all by some supernatural authority, it must, like all human wisdom, be submitted to continual correction. Lowell said: "New occasions teach new duties, time makes ancient good uncouth." This is not merely a matter of theoretic importance. To question what has long passed as moral truth is a vital duty, if we are to be saved from the blind moral fanaticism which has been one of the worst oppressions of mankind and the greatest impediment to progress.

Adler was a modern social engineer who had the courage to apply the scientific method to both religion and ethics. He did not pretend to have all the answers but he insisted on exploring, examining, testing, and thus adding to what is known. He constantly reëxamined the religious and ethical hypotheses of the past in the light of new discoveries. These are the methods that revealed to him startling facts and gave him amazing insights. He clearly realized that there is still a vast area of unknown in the realm of human relations. Adler's experience and insight have convinced the writer that in ethics and religion, like in science, one must have perfect freedom to examine and explore and not be hindered by any dogmatic belief that denies such freedom.

His ethical philosophy also demanded that we practice what we preach; that faith in our ethical convictions has little significance without practice; and that we must have as much concern for others as we have for ourselves. In regard to this his slogan was "Unanimity in deed, diversity in creed." Mature people ought to be fully aware that standards of ethics and morality arise and come into being largely because of the self-respect that individuals have and that these standards will be maintained just as long as this self-respect continues.

It is not easy to hold, maintain, and practice this ethical religion because we are constantly aware of our weaknesses, shortcomings and incapacities. But mature people ought to understand that even such a difficult ethical religion can grow by daily practice; it certainly cannot develop by just talking about it. It can even be stimulated by frustration and defeat. Adler believed in being a practising liberal, not simply a liberal on the theoretical plane. He was convinced that the mere drafting of high ethical principles was not enough but that the important thing was the capacity for making ethical principles prevail in the human world. His theory of ethics, therefore, was practical and at the same time rational, free of external authority and applicable to natural conduct based on the democratic ideal of free inquiry into the principles by which our natural human activities can be harmoniously integrated.

He revitalized the basic ethical dictum that has come out of centuries of human experience and living, namely, that every human being ought to count and is intrinsically worth-while. Ethical leaders in all periods had this profound faith in man's integrity and goodness. It was this faith that led Thomas Jefferson to include in the Declaration of Independence the new statement that all men are created equal, by which he meant that all men in a democracy are equally responsible for conducting themselves on an ethical plane. Many thinkers have denied this fundamental ethical belief, and general practice still runs contrary to it. It was Adler's mission to validate this claim and make it a living reality. And it is every man's duty in a democracy to help link up his activities—be they in art, science, or industry—so as to achieve this ideal.

It was out of the womb of this ethical postulate that there was born the new life we call political democracy. It is around this ethical postulate and its infant offspring, democracy, that the present world conflict rages. For Soviet Russia, with her dogmatic belief in materialism and economic determinism, scorns and denies this ethical dictum, despises anything related to political democracy and individual freedom, and is pledged to destroy all of these.

One of the great contributions of Adler to the twentieth century mind was the liberating influence which he exerted in religious and ethical thinking. He liberated us not merely from dogmatism and authoritarianism, from which, Heaven knows, we need still to be liberated, but also from tradition in the sense of unexamined tradition. The effect his teaching had on me was a new way of looking at my ideas and asking myself on what grounds I really believed these things.

Adler, with Channing, Emerson, and Theodore Parker, was the first in the modern world to say that ethics is a human affair. It is not simply a reflection and edict of some supernatural, external power; it is something we do *to* the world by our conduct. It was the liberation of ethics from a rigid framework of tradition and dogma.

Another important contribution Adler made in the field of ethical conduct was his insistence that ethics cannot take a step without an ideal of the whole. In the sphere of conduct, if there is to be certainty at all, in regard to right as distinguished from wrong, we must have a standard of an ideal plan of the whole. Otherwise, we will continue to have the fragmentation of life that we see all around us and the internal disintegration of our national existence. This lack of integration with the human race causes us to live in pieces. If further continued, the future of American democracy and Western free institutions and the human community may be destroyed. Quoting Adler again:

> We must creatively conceive the ideal of the whole and educe every partial mode of ethical conduct from that. . . . Hence the conclusion that there is no possibility of establishing the conception of worth unless we have some ideal of the whole, in which and in relation to which the incomparable worth-whileness of a human being can be made good.

The necessity of an ideal of the whole is the key to ethical conduct in our time, because our physical world has been welded into a closely knit unit and demands its counterpart in the spiritual world. Adler further states: "Now the ideal of the whole is a plan

or scheme in which the constructive principles of the mind are conceived as having untrammeled course and unhindered application and the task of world building, or rather universe building, is our idea carried out to completion." This surely means that personal ethics, as taught by past religious leaders is inadequate to our present needs and must be implemented by a social ethic. We must not only think of our own immediate family obligations but we must identify ourselves with the Asians and Africans in their revolution from a primitive way of life to a modern way of life, a revolution from Colonialism to independence. We must do everything in our power to help these millions of humans to achieve their independence. We who believe in democracy ought to feel it our duty to reduce, and perhaps abolish in the end, the odious and evil social inequalities and injustices between one class of human beings and another, which has been one of the darkest blots of our civilization.

Adler was fully aware of the intellectual and spiritual confusion that exists in our present changing society. He understood that religion was undergoing a transformation of major proportions, and that the bases of all previous organized religions are under question. He felt keenly the tendency in all the old religions to rigidity and conformity, and that much of religion is in a tragic state and therefore cannot move forward. He was determined to liberate religion from these chains and impediments, and therefore he concentrated his main effort on integrating and synthesizing religion and ethics. He therefore proclaimed the supremacy of the ethical ideal.

Adler was probably the first leader in the educational field to demand that our schools should teach moral and spiritual values because he so clearly understood that democracy was an experiment in moral and spiritual values. He believed that the school should equip our boys and girls—our new generation—to live by these values: values that may lend the dignity to our lives that democracy so strongly demands. He fully realized that we are all products of this American education, that our leaders and their important ideas and decisions are formed by our public education. On many occasions I heard him say that no definitions of moral and spiritual values are final and that they must be constantly reinterpreted and even reconstructed to meet new conditions and new needs. Education is a continuing process. He constantly repeated that these values and standards are necessary because they exalt and refine and have social consequences.

These moral and spiritual values are yardsticks that serve as guides—guides in the different levels of living. There are many blind spots in our present educational system because we are indifferent to teaching these values, due to attacks by traditional religious, political, and economic organizations. The truth is just beginning to take hold that the essential thing in a democracy is to develop in our children the character traits that will make them responsible citizens. The teaching of moral and spiritual values must become the objective of the school, helping us to bridge from a biological way of life to a sociological, human way of life.

Adler introduced progressive methods to teach children the art of working and playing together from their first day in school. He proved by this experiment that student activities and student councils develop democratic attitudes out of democratic experience. He also suggested opening public school buildings for community forums and adult education to further identify and integrate school and community. The American school in many communities has become a powerhouse of democracy due to this educational pioneering of Adler. He made the teaching of democratic citizenship an integral part of the whole educational process. His influence and "progressive" education have been far-reaching. The American school system is coming to accept his concept of education as a process of developing the capacities of the individual by inducing him to express himself creatively and to practice self-discipline in coöperative effort—thus preparing for living. The Adler approach is all but indispensable to democracy. One might almost say it *is* the basic idea of democracy applied to education.

There is nothing in our Constitution preventing systematic study in our schools of this greatest of social sciences, namely, ethics. Children as well as adults ought to be taught the duties and responsibilities in our many and varied human relations. Time and experience have taught, and the Supreme Court in its decision has reaffirmed, the wisdom and the necessity of maintaining a wall—high and impregnable—between Church and State as a means of assuring complete freedom of religious worship. This does not apply to ethics. Denying our children the insight into ethical truth and conduct between individual and individual, group and group, and nation and nation, is something else, and we do it at our peril. We need this education for the ethical regeneration of our time. Not our country alone, but other countries are waking up to the paramount importance of ethical considerations before all others in the practical solution of the great economic, social, and political problems that confront them. The banner of the independence and supremacy of ethics must be spread far and wide!

On this ethical foundation we are trying to build a new edifice called democracy. Out of centuries of ethical experience and practice, there is finally emerging this new political community called democracy. *Demos* means the people, and so democracy means a government by the people; a government in which the supreme power is retained and exercised by the people. Behind our present concept of democracy, both as an ideal and as a principle of group action, lies a wealth of history. Democracy is more than a form of government originating with the ancient Greeks. Some of its deeper implications go back to the dawn of social organization.

The Roman Republic gave us the concept of constitutionalism and the rule of law. The Judeo-Christian concept took possession of the Roman world to give new content to the emerging democratic ideal.

The American frontier offered the first favorable soil for this new outlook. Democracy, then, in modern usage, is more than a form of government or a particular set of political institutions which may have run their course. It carries a rich heritage of religious and political ideals. It is not a temporary experiment that has failed but a principle of social integration that has hundreds of generations of aspiration and practical achievement behind it. Its basic assumption is the indefeasible worth of the individual human being. It reconciles freedom and organization by means of the creative participation of the individual in the organized group. It is a practice in social equality and human brotherhood.

We must never overlook the fact that political democracy in the United States came into being as the result of two systems and ideologies in conflict. The one system was the British system of politics, economy, and ecclesiasticism. The system was an oligarchy composed of lords collected around their monarchy, and to this was added the clerical hierarchy. To be sure, they had a "popular" legislative body, the House of Commons, under a restricted suffrage. Their foreign policy was based on Colonialism and imperialism, and they looked upon their colonies as subordinates socially and intellectually, as they were politically and economically. The king and the members of the titled aristocracy, who formed the inner circle, deemed it their right and privilege to hold the colonies tightly and permanently under the British government which they controlled. So that the people in the thirteen colonies were looked upon as subjects rather than citizens.

Opposed to all this was the new, precious, and unique idea of the Founding Fathers incorporated in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, that all men must be free and not enslaved, that they must exercise the rights of citizenship and determine their own destiny. We must, therefore, be aware and teach our boys and girls that the American Revolution rested on a change of mind and heart that took place in the men and women of 1776; that these new ideas and ideals were the cause of the Revolutionary War. While the Boston Tea Party, the Battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill, the sufferings of the Continental Army at Valley Forge, the final surrender of the British at Saratoga and then at Yorktown are admirable things to teach our young Americans, they are not of primary importance. They were but the effects of deeply rooted causes. It was the cause and not the effect that shaped the pattern of the American mind and character.

The early settlers were far advanced in civilization, policy and manners, in their ideas of self-government, and in the bonds of civil union. From the beginning, government played a necessary and formative role in the founding and development of the colonies. It was this training in self-government that prepared the colonies for asserting their political and economic rights against British authority. This new way of self-government meant assuming responsibility to make choices and decisions.. It was easier to go along the old way: the traditional way. People prefer to have the choices made for them by the Mussolinis and the Hitlers and the Stalins. People have accepted totalitarianism from time immemorial. The spirit of the Revolutionary War was the spirit of self-reliance, the passion for freedom resting on the fundamental basis that every human being is important and must count. These early Americans preferred to be citizens rather than subjects. They hungered for freedom of religion and freedom of speech.

We must, therefore, have it clear in our minds that democracy is vastly different from the *isms* we hear so much about. All the *isms* are dogmatic and static. On the other hand, democracy is not a system but a *principle of growth* that must be ever zealously pursued and must ever remain an unfinished task. It rests on the long experience of the race that men do not grow, learn, and create except when they are free. Democracy, whose basic principles are freedom and inviolability of personality, must be made free from exploitation, want, and insecurity.

It is only in a democracy that men make government, which means that governments derive their power from the *consent* of the governed. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights derive their authority directly *from the people.* These are the vital things that make democracy free of that bitter canker that exists in both capitalism and Communism, for democracy means the importance of the individual in and through society. It means that all men can have a share in man-made wealth. In a genuine democracy it is basic that great economic power shall not rest in small but powerful groups. It means working out her social system in freedom and security through peaceful democratic methods—changes wrought without force or violence and without jeopardizing freedom.

We must constantly be aware that in our democracy there are certain "inalienable rights," never to be encroached upon without mortal danger to democracy. These are the civil rights or civil liberties which protect the citadel of man's individuality, particularly his right to think and speak. The defense of civil liberties is of the essence of democracy, for it is an affirmation of the dignity and worth of the individual. These civil liberties should not be suppressed even in wartime. In our present struggle with Russia's totalitarian government, whose distinguishing feature is the absence of civil liberties, they should be affirmed more than ever.

Freedom of speech is, of course, the central freedom. Freedom of thought and conscience, freedom of religious worship and assembly, all depend on freedom of speech. Democracy has always relied on discussion, on reason, on deliberation, and must continue to do so if it is to survive.

Freedom of the individual is, then, not merely an end in itself but a means, a technique of effective democracy. A democratic society must seek to give worth and dignity and the opportunity for creative self-expression to all its members, not merely because that is its proper goal but equally because that is the condition of its survival.

If every individual is to be free to grow to full stature, he must have a favorable environment. Modern medicine, modern nutrition, modern psychology know what sort of environment that is. The physical conditions of sunshine, fresh air, and good food are most important in childhood, and so are some of the psychological conditions of a secure and harmonious home; but they are only to a degree less important for the adult. Economic security and adequate income do not in themselves create those conditions, though they are all but indispensable. The feeling of personal worth and significance, particularly as expressed in meaningful work, is perhaps of greatest importance for psychological stability and health.

Every citizen in a democracy should have the opportunity for creative work and also the "adventures of civilization." A word from the Old Scripture keeps running in my head: "The stone which the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone." The stone which the builders of the ancient civilizations rejected, and which the new dictators imitate, was the *common people.* They raised their proud structures on the basis of privilege. Today the common people are recognized by democracy as the true cornerstone on which the new type of civilization must be reared; and everywhere, in religion, in politics, in industry, the democratic ideal is gaining ground. It is because the writer firmly believes that the United States stands for this unspeakably valuable democratic ideal, not only for

itself but for all the nations of the world, that I regard its complete coöperation with and dedication to the United Nations as an event of signal international importance, lighting up the renewed hope for all mankind. Here is something worth working for, living for, and fighting for.

Many serious conflicts are still in the offing, for we must be realistic and be aware that there is a strong current in many quarters of the world, and even in our own country, toward regarding man as a mere cog in an impersonal machine. It is the supreme business of democracy to define and defend the dignity and worth of the individual. He has a higher destiny than to be a creature of an economic system or a political order.

At this point I would say that the criterion is this: whatever enhances individual personality and favors the full participation of the individual in collective action is democratic. Hence, the techniques for democratic self-government of industry in the context of a democratic society must be instituted and applied if democracy is to survive. If democracy is a valid and workable principle in the organization of political groups, then it is valid also in the economic organization. A democratic world must be an organic growth throughout its activities: religious, political, and economic. Autocracy in the industrial enterprise must give way to responsible, constitutional government. The day of the totalitarian owner and employer and the domineering foreman must pass. The master and servant relationship must be replaced by a concept of coöperation between specialists in management on the one hand and specialists in various and mechanical skills on the other.

Where freedom is only negative, democracy cannot survive. Democracy means positive freedom, the opportunity of all men to express themselves affirmatively and creatively in all the areas of human activity. Man is a creature of infinite spiritual possibilities and potentialities. Democracy takes its moral sanction from its ability to release these potentialities. It takes its pragmatic sanction from the strength that accrues to it from their release, and the progress man has made in civilization has been achieved through this release. Freedom of the individual is, then, not merely an end in itself but a means, a technique of effective democracy.

The final step to achieve an integrated, dynamic democracy is to create educational equality and freedom for all. One individual or even many individuals cannot by themselves create a democracy or make it work. It is the collective energies and determination of *all the people* which must be mobilized for the free world. We need a kind of individual freedom and a collective universal intelligence that is general and shared and that has the backing and guidance of socially organized authoritative control.

We must try out new resources, hitherto untried means, on a large scale in the broad field of human, social relationships. This new source, in my judgment, is the utilization of organized, collective intelligence, the manifold benefits and values of which we have substantial and reliable evidence in the narrower field of science.

The entire modern industrial development is the fruit of the technological applications of science. By and large, the economic changes of recent centuries have been parasitic upon the advances made in natural science.

There is not a single process involved in the production and distribution of goods that is not dependent upon the utilization of results which are consequences of the method of collective organic intelligence working in mathematics, physics, and chemistry. To speak boldly, it is a plain falsehood that the advances which the defenders of the existing regime point to as justification for its continuance are due to mere individualistic initiative and enterprise. Individualistic initiative and enterprise have sequestered and appropriated the fruits of collective coöperative intelligence. Without the aid and support of this organized intelligence, the individual is impotent and helpless. We must learn to recognize that the true and final source of change has been, and now is, the corporate intelligence embodied in science.

There is no need to dwell upon the enormous obstacles that stand in the way of extending from its present field to the larger field of human relations the control of organized intelligence operating through the release of individual powers and capabilities. The creation of this organized intelligence on a national and international scale depends largely upon our educators and our educational methods. Our teachers must therefore be especially trained to teach human relations. The importance of their function must be recognized and adequately rewarded by a society anxious to encourage the entry into the teaching profession of the ablest kind of persons to prepare human beings for the art of living. This is democracy's most important task: a task that demands qualities of the very highest order.

Some parents and teachers may recognize the importance of all this, but Congressmen and Senators have thus far failed to bring them to fruition. Our teachers are underpaid and our schools and their outmoded methods are utterly inadequate to bring this goal into realization. It is difficult to predict when that extension will be effectually actualized. But I do want to emphasize that the problem of the relation of authority and freedom, of stability and change, if it can be solved, will be solved in this way—through a *world-wide, organized intelligence and public opinion.*

We ought to know by now that democracy cannot be fully realized by just a small governing elite; that in a democracy science must be widely disseminated. Through public education we must develop an educated, alert majority in whose minds there is incorporated a clear understanding of the democratic ideal. In a realistic democracy every citizen would be a social scientist, able in collaboration with others to use the scientific method in solving the problems of group activity. Not only must democracy foster science but in order that democracy may survive it must *become* a science.

The use of reason by free minds in a democracy is dependent on an infinite variety of institutions and methods. The only unifying, cohesive element should be an all-pervasive atmosphere of tolerance and devotion to the truth, which we should call the open market for ideas. With the necessary educational devices and a belief in the power of the human mind and its spiritual basis, there is no limit to what free men can undertake and accomplish.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

COUNCIL OF LIBERAL CHURCHES

By separate and joint action, the American Unitarian Association and the Universalist Church of America voted to federate by setting up the Council of Liberal Churches (Unitarian-Universalist). The action was taken at the General Conferences of the two bodies, held concurrently at Andover, Massachusetts, August 21-24. The Unitarian vote favoring Federal Union was unanimous, i.e., technically "without dissent." Only twelve negative votes were recorded by the Universalists. Thus, after six years of planning by three Joint Commissions, the first steps toward an enlarged liberal religious movement have been taken.

The plan as presented by the Joint Commission was adopted almost in its entirety. Only two major changes were made. The name, "The United Liberal Church Council," as proposed, was rejected in favor of "The Council of Liberal Churches." Also, the respective bodies amended the proposed By-laws so as to prohibit paid employes of either the A.U.A. or the U.C.A., or their affiliated organizations, from serving on the Council with the exception that the President of the A.U.A. and the General Superintendent of the U.C.A. are to be members of the Council, ex-officio, but without vote.

The new Council was given the "sole" responsibility for operating in the areas of education, publication, and public relations when such divisions have been merged and placed in operation. The Council is to determine the speed with which such mergers are to take place.

One of the features of the Conference, which contributed to its effectiveness and harmony, was the holding of some thirty-six simultaneous group discussions. This gave all points of view adequate opportunity for expression. The group leaders reported their findings to the Commission, which was then able to evaluate the sentiment and make such adaptations in their proposals as seemed beneficial.

Not all of the time was spent in discussion or business sessions. Among the highlights of the meetings were addresses by Dr. Karl W. Deutsch of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Claude M. Fuess, Headmaster Emeritus of Phillips Academy; and Dr. Merrill E. Bush, Headmaster of the Friends Central School in Philadelphia and former Director of Adult Education of the A.U.A. Dr. Bush spoke at the banquet which was presided over by Mr. William Roger Greeley, Moderator-elect of the A.U.A. Mr. Owen D. Young, famous industrialist, diplomat, and Universalist layman, also spoke at the banquet.

The Western Unitarian Conference was well represented at Andover by both ministers and laymen. Among the lay delegates present were representatives from Chicago, St. Louis, Toledo, Cincinnati, Dayton, Rockford, Bloomington (Indiana), Detroit, and Kalamazoo. Among the clergy present were E. Burdette Backus, Thaddeus B. Clark, Arthur Foote, Max Gaebler, Randall S. Hilton, L. Wendell Hughes, Homer Jack, Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Arthur Olsen, Leslie T. Pennington, Tracy M. Pullman, Wallace W. Robbins, and Arnold Westwood.

The Western Conference is well represented on the new Council of Liberal Churches. Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Chicago; Mrs. Paul Caskey, Rockford; and Mr. Kurt Hanslowe, Detroit, are members of the new council. The other Unitarian members are Dr. Karl Deutsch, M.I.T.; Rev. Harry Meserve, San Francisco; Rev. George Marshall, Niagara Falls; Dr. Merrill Bush, Philadelphia; Rev. Angus Cameron, Montreal; and Dr. Frederick M. Eliot, ex-officio.

The Universalist members are Rev. Albert Niles, Mr. S. D. Butler, Mr. Samuel Collins, Rev. George LaPointe, Mr. Charles Collyer, Rev. Carl Olsen, Mr. Allan Sawyer, Mrs. Cyrus Springall, Dr. Robert Cummins, ex-officio.

GENEVA

The Geneva Summer Assembly again hit the "jack pot" as far as fun and program were concerned. The morning lecture by Prof. Orville Linck, of Wayne University, Detroit, maintained the high standards expected by Geneva delegates. One of them said this fall that "that man Linck is the best I've ever heard!"

The general enthusiasm for, and approval of, the entire faculty was music to the ears of the administration and the Planning Council. The Council, meeting in Chicago, September 18 and 19, planned an equally attractive program for next summer. Remember the dates—June 27 to July 3. Register early with Esther L. Heinrich, 629 S. Grove Avenue, Oak Park, Illinois.

The total registration this year was 413. The excellence of the attendance made it possible to show an operating balance of $155.96. This compares with an operating deficit of $234.85 of the previous year. Generous grants by the Board of the Western Unitarian Conference totalling $400 also contributed greatly to the favorable financial situation.

One of the regrets of the administration this year was the limitation on available accommodations. This was true in all price ranges and particularly so in the lower price ranges. The Assembly and camp management are working toward remedying this situation next year. All available accommodations were filled this year and some delegates even lived off the grounds. It is fully expected that more space in each of the price ranges will be available next June. Again, early registration will help insure your getting the accommodations desired. It is truly regrettable that some applications had to be turned down and that the desires of others could not be met. This should not happen next year.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

Subject to the approval of the W.U.C. Board, and in the absence of the President who was out of the country, the Vice-President, Leslie T. Pennington, appointed the following to serve for three years on the Geneva Planning Council:

Mrs. H. Hadley Grimm, St. Louis
Mr. Albert Hayes, Chicago
Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, Chicago.

The Planning Council for next year is:

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, chairman
Albert Hayes, Chicago, vice-chairman

Mrs. Bernard Heinrich, Oak Park, Secretary and Registrar
Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, Treasurer and Business Manager
Mrs. Ralph Hicks, Evanston
Alfred J. M. Henricksen, Iowa City
Max D. Gaebler, Madison
Mrs. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford
Mrs. H. Hadley Grimm, St. Louis
Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, Chicago

Also appointed for one-year terms were the members of the Religious Education Committee consisting of:

Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, Chicago (First), chairman
Mrs. Harry Adams, Kansas City
Mrs. L. S. Anderson, Chicago (Beverly)
Mrs. Erwin Gaede, South Bend
Mrs. Francis Hughes, Detroit
Mr. Raymond Murray, Bloomington (Indiana)
Mr. Oscar Quimby, Cincinnati (First)

The Program Committee for the Annual Meeting is as follows:

Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis, chairman
Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, secretary
Elmer Pounds, St. Louis
Dudley F. Giberson, Alton
Mrs. Christian Andreason, Springfield

NEWS NOTES

Quincy—Rev. Thomas Maloney, formerly of Davenport, became the minister of the Quincy, Illinois, Unitarian Church on September 1st.

Hanska—The church at Hanska has during the past two years almost completely refurbished all of its properties. The Union Hall in town has been reconditioned and redecorated. The same is true of the beautiful church on the hill and its annex, the dining hall. The description of the redecorated interior of the church sounds very satisfying artistically and aesthetically and should greatly enhance the worship atmosphere.

Third Church, Chicago—Third Church will celebrate its 85th anniversary this fall. The Board is considering a major extension project.

Indianapolis, All Souls—Dr. E. Burdette Backus has announced his retirement as of January 1st.

St. Louis—Christopher Moore, who graduated from Meadville Theological School in June, is serving as Associate Minister to Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark. Ordination services were held for Mr. Moore on September 29. He is the son of Mrs. Dudley Moore, Director of Home Service Projects for the Unitarian Service Committee.

Detroit—The new Northwest Unitarian-Universalist Church has called Rev. Frank Gentile to its ministry. Mr. Gentile was minister of the Universalist church in Eldorado, Ohio.

Flint—Rev. John Morgan spent the summer in Flint. Besides conducting several special summer programs for the church, he also taught at the Flint Junior College.

Denver—A three day training session was held for the church school teachers September 16, 17 and 18.

Evanston—A project to remodel the church building so as to enlarge the seating capacity and church school facilities is being planned. Dr. Homer A. Jack, minister, preached during the summer at Community Church in New York City.

Madison—A greatly augmented church school program has been undertaken, also a greatly increased church budget.

Duluth—A completely redecorated, streamlined, and modernized kitchen was installed during the summer. Also a new worship center for the church school.

Colorado Springs—This group continues to improve their church property. A new linoleum floor has been laid in the dining room and church school rooms.

Detroit—The Church of Our Father has remodeled the balcony of McCollester Hall, making it into classrooms and a worship center for the Lower School.

Chicago—Gaynor Hilton, daughter of the Conference Secretary, will be attending the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago this year.

Minneapolis—Mrs. B. A. McClellan, former member of the Western Conference and Geneva Boards, has been appointed Director of the Church School.

Iowa City—The parsonage was painted during the summer. A worship-through-work day was conducted Sunday, September 13, resulting in the church building being completely cleaned.

Dayton—The Alliance gave a potluck dinner in honor of Mrs. Wendell Hughes, wife of the minister.

Chicago, First Church—Due to the overcrowding of nearby Ray School, John Woolman Hall has been turned over to the Board of Education to house the first grade classes.

TRAVEL ABROAD

Rev. Arthur Olsen, Toledo, visited both Palestine and Norway this summer.

Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer and Mrs. Buehrer visited their daughters in Canada and England this summer. They also toured the continent. They were isolated several days in Paris by the general strike and only got out by joining with others in chartering a bus to take them to the German border.

Dr. Preston Bradley was again in Europe during the summer vacation. He also preached in several Unitarian churches in England.

Kenneth J. Smith, Duluth, spent the summer in Europe. He reports having seen "a miracle of reconstruction" in West Germany.

Mr. Herbert E. Clapham, Treasurer of the Western Unitarian Conference, and Mrs. Clapham spent six weeks in England and Europe. A letter from Norwich, England, Mr. Clapham's home town, told of attending services in the Octagon Chapel, a Unitarian stronghold for over two hundred years.

AREA CONFERENCES

Minnesota—St. Paul: October 2-3
Abraham Lincoln—St. Louis: October 9-10
Colorado—Boulder: October 17
Chicago Area—Evanston: October 18
Michigan Area—Toledo: October 23-24
Iowa Association—Cedar Rapids: October 23-24
Ohio Valley—Dayton: October 25

RADIO

The newest radio program to be undertaken by a Western Conference church is at South Bend. Mr. Gaede, minister, began a series of thirteen broadcasts on September 13. The series, known as "The Unitarian Quarter Hour," can be heard every Sunday at 9:15 a.m. over station WHOT.